

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136, Applicant petitions the Commissioner to extend the time for response for one month, from June 22, 2005 to July 22, 2005.

Claims 1-13 were pending. Claims 1 and 10-13 have been amended. Claims 14-16 are newly submitted. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 1-16 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. The §102/103 Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331 ("Alexander").

Claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0162093 ("Zhou").

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for converting display source code of a non-web enabled application on a server to a network interactive web-browser page.

In particular, the method includes resolving the display source code of the non-web enabled application into a plurality of record formats, and for each of the plurality of record formats, resolving a plurality of references within the record format to database files. The plurality of references are further parsed to a web-language file using nested tags to capture a hierarchy and relationship of the plurality of references to create network user interface pages. The network user interface pages are then converted to an object-oriented platform-independent network language.

JUN-27-05

11:42

FROM-SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

650-493-4549

T-084 P.013/015 F-138

Alexander discloses a system and process for managing content organized in a tag-delimited template (see Abstract). Alexander, however, fails to disclose several aspects of claim 1.

First, Alexander fails to disclose a method for converting display source code of a non-web enabled application on a server to a network interactive web-browser page, as required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Instead, Alexander discloses only techniques for managing content of web enabled applications – i.e., web pages using a metadata template (see Abstract; col. 2, ll. 49-56). More specifically, Alexander discloses a metadata (base) template that can be used to describe information about a number of web pages 49-52, as shown in FIG. 3 (col. 6, ll. 24-37). Thus, because Alexander manages only content associated with web pages Alexander, therefore, fails to disclose a method for converting display source code of a non-web enabled application on a server to a network interactive web-browser page.

Second, Alexander fails to disclose resolving the display source code of a non-web enabled application into a plurality of record formats. As discussed above, Alexander discloses only techniques for managing content associated with web pages. Thus, Alexander cannot disclose resolving the display source code of a non-web enabled application into a plurality of record formats, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Moreover, while Alexander may process HTTP content of a web page, as suggested by the Examiner, Alexander fails to disclose that such HTTP processing includes resolving the display source code of a non-web enabled application – or any application – into a plurality of records format. See MPEP 2163.07 - “To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may

result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Claim 1 is, therefore, allowable over Alexander.

Claims 2-9 and 14-15 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to claim 1.

Independent claims 10, 11, 12 and 13 (and the claims that depend therefrom) incorporate limitations similar to claim 1, and are also allowable for at least the reasons that apply to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 1-16 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin M. Vivian

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 53,727

(650) 493-4540

June 27, 2005